



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,175	08/10/2001	Christopher J. Paszty	00-1229	6346
20306	7590	10/06/2003		
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF 300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE SUITE 3200 CHICAGO, IL 60606			EXAMINER SEHARASEYON, JEGATHEESAN	
			ART UNIT 1647	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/928,175	PASZTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jegatheesan Seharaseyon	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06/05/02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-12 and 42-45 are drawn to a nucleic acid encoding a polypeptide, a vector and a host cell, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
- II. Claims 13-17, 37-41, 46, 47, 50 and 58 are drawn to a protein, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- III. Claim 18-32, 34 and 35 drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
- IV. Claim 33 is drawn to a method of treatment using a binding agent in class 424, subclass 184.1.
- V. Claim 36 is drawn to a method of detecting the polypeptide in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- VI. Claim 48 is drawn to a method of treatment by administering polypeptide, classified in class 424, subclass 158.1.
- VII. Claim 49 is drawn to a method of diagnosing, classified in class 424, subclass 9.341.
- VIII. Claim 51 and 52 are drawn to a method of identifying a compound that binds to a polypeptide in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- IX. Claim 53 is drawn to a method of modulating levels of a polypeptide in an animal by administering nucleic acids in class 435, subclass 6.

X. Claims 54 and 55 are drawn to transgenic non-human animals in class 800, subclass 13.

XI. Claims 56 and 57 are drawn to nucleic acid molecules attached to a solid support in class 435 subclass 4.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other, for the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, and III are independent and distinct, each from the other, because they are products which possess characteristic differences in structure and function and each has an independent utility that is distinct for each invention which cannot be exchanged. The polynucleotide of invention I can be used to make a hybridization probe or can be used in gene therapy as well as in the production of the protein of interest. The polypeptide of invention II can be used as a probe or used therapeutically or diagnostically, e.g. in screening. The antibody of invention III can be used to obtain the polynucleotide of Group I, and can also be used in diagnostics, e.g. as a probe in immunoassays. In addition, the searches are not coextensive for these products.

Inventions I and (IX- XI) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product of invention I can be used in gene therapy or in production of the recombinant protein.

Inventions I and (III-VIII) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different

modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together.

Inventions II and (III- VIII) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product of invention II can be used in assays for the identification of aganoist and antaganoist of the polypeptide.

Inventions II and IX- XI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together.

Inventions III and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product of invention III can be used in the screening of the expression libraries.

Inventions III and (IX- XI) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different

Art Unit: 1647

modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together.

Inventions V-XII are independent and distinct, each from the other, because the methods are practiced with materially different process steps for materially different purposes and each method requires a non-coextensive search because of different starting materials, process steps and goals.

In addition, the searches are not coextensive for these inventions. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

2. The claims of Groups I -II are drawn to multiple sequences (SEQ ID NO: 1-23). Each of the different sequences are independent and distinct because no common structural or functional properties are shared. Accordingly, these sequences are each subject to restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121. Regardless of the Group elected, Applicant is additionally required to elect a single sequence, which if determined to be patentable, would also be patentably distinct from the other sequences. This requirement is made under 1192 O.G.68 Notice (November 19, 1996), as examination of more than one sequence in one application would result in an undue burden on the PTO.

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

4. Claim 58 currently contain multiple species. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 58 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/928,175
Art Unit: 1647

Page 7

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jegatheesan Seharaseyon whose telephone number is 703-305-1112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on 703-308-4623. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0294 for regular communications and 703-308-4227 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

JS

Gary L. Kunz
GARY KUNZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600